

BACONIANA

VOL. XXV.

No. 99.

APRIL, 1941.

EDITORIAL.

FOR the first time, after private circulation since 1886, BACONIANA was in January last offered for sale to the public. It is hoped to continue its publication quarterly and, as time and opportunity allow, to increase its size and scope. BACONIANA can be obtained or ordered at any of the branches of W. H. Smith & Sons, Ltd.

The howl of the sirens has been the subject of correspondence between the Music Critic of *The Times* and Mr. R. L. Eagle, who has taken the opportunity of drawing attention to Shakespeare's deep knowledge and love of music.

"It is remarkable," he writes, "that in *King Lear* (I.2) Shakespeare makes the villain, Edmund, sing four notes containing an augmented fourth as symbolical of the devilry in his mind, and the conspiracy against his brother which has just been evolved in his brain. The notes given in the text of the play are "*Fa, sol, la, mi*" a musical phrase which our ancestors appear to have abhorred and called *Diabolus in Musica*."

"Shakespeare," replied the Music Critic, "like every trained musician of his day, would be familiar with this saying, but he goes even further and through the mouth of Edmund makes the siren notes speak in their own defence, 'My cue is villainous melancholy with a sigh like Tom O'Bedlam. O these eclipses do portend these divisions *fa, sol, la, mi*.'"

King Lear was published in Quarto in 1608, but it was not until the First Folio appeared fifteen years later in 1623 that the musical phrase was referred to in Edmund's speech. How is this to be explained? How did Shakspeare

become a trained musician or like one? Shakspeare had retired to Stratford, dying there in 1616 and, having regard to what we know of his normal activities in his native town, was hardly likely to have been occupying himself with the study of music. Bacon, however, in October, 1622, began his *Sylva Sylvarum* which included a chapter entitled "Experiments in Consort touching Music," treating the subject of Concord and Discord. He actually mentions the tritone which is an interval composed of three whole steps or tones. This interval, even when only suggested, was regarded as peculiarly objectionable; whence the proverb "mi contra fa diabolus est." It was, as has been said, called the Devil in Music.

It is not surprising that other correspondents to *The Times* pleaded for alteration of the distressing chromatic wailing of Hitler's signature tune; it is certainly the "Devil in Music," one of the most loathsome sounds which have ever assaulted the ears and nerves of men and women. It seems that Shakespeare thought so too, even when it was unaccompanied by the horrors of which in these more enlightened times it is the prelude.

Mr. J. J. Hogan, Professor of English Literature in University College, Dublin, lecturing to the Dublin Literary Society on "Recent Shakespearean Criticism" said according to the *Irish Independent* that the close examination of Shakespeare's imagery disposed of what he called the Bacon theory because Bacon and Shakespeare used different sets of images. We must allow presumably that Professors of English Literature read Shakespeare occasionally but except perhaps the *Essays*, parts of the *Advancement of Learning* and *Novum Organum* we very much doubt whether they read or indeed have ever read Bacon.

Professor Caroline Spurgeon is the most recent authority. She has made the subject peculiarly her own and her book "*Shakespeare's Imagery*," 1935, Cambridge University Press, is probably that on which the lecturer relied. We will offer one or two examples of the similarity of Bacon's and Shakespeare's "sets of images" as Professor Hogan

calls them. Professor Spurgeon writes "a surer indication of his (Shakespeare's) view is that he constantly symbolises it (war) by and associates it with loud and hideous noises." And so does Bacon, adding that men of war pen tragedies in blood, and, worst of all, make all the virtues accessory to bloodshed.

Again the loud and hideous noises of war affright, as both Bacon and Shakespeare agree. Bacon compares civil war with the heat of a fever; foreign war to the heat of exercise serving to keep the body in health. Shakespeare does exactly the same. Shakespeare thinks of Peace as an apoplexy and also as a kind of lethargy. Bacon uses the same images.

There are innumerable other examples of identical thought and expression, and anyone who is familiar with the work both of Bacon and Shakespeare cannot open one without being vividly reminded of the other. Both writers if, for the sake of argument, we are to consider them as two persons, thought in the same way: the cast of mind in each was pictorial, figurative and metaphorical; both vivified the driest details with the electricity of imagination and each reiterated the same figures of speech again and again.

The minds of Bacon and of Shakespeare differ occasionally in expression but not in nature or content. Bacon's *Antitheta* must never be forgotten when comparing his mind with that of Shakespeare; the one arguing *pro* must not be contrasted with the other arguing *contra*. Bacon was fond of presenting his ideas in the form of masquerade, marshalling them in contending or contrasting ranks. He allowed his mind to play with both sides of a question—the yea and the nay of it, indulging his fancy in varying lights of these. The same mind philosophises in the stately periods of *De Augmentis* and frivols with Falstaff in *Eastcheap*. Thus there is much Baconian prose in Shakespeare and much Shakespearean poetry in Bacon. There is the same mastery of style in both; in both the style is perfectly adapted to the subject.

The statement reiterated ad nauseam that the minds of

Bacon and Shakespeare are utterly different is obviously false to anyone who knows the work of both. No *two* minds think alike on all subjects; no two voices, no two faces, no two finger prints are ever quite alike. "Men's labour should be turned to the investigation and observation of the analogies of things as well in wholes as in parts. For these it is that detect Unity" (*Novum Organum* Bk. II xxvii). In his series of articles, Dr. W. S. Melsome is adopting this method of comparative anatomy. He is investigating and observing the analogies in the Bacon-Shakespeare minds as well in wholes as in parts and is thus detecting their unity. He concentrates on a single speech or scene, collects from several places what may be compared to the loose pieces of a jig-saw puzzle and then fits them together to form part of a picture. The method is characteristically Baconian:—"diligent dissection and anatomy."

Readers of BACONIANA are, we suppose, no exceptions to the general rule that people are either open or impervious to argument. Among the latter there are of course those who are professionally or officially impervious—the deeply committed orthodox critics, trustees of Shakespearean institutions, academicians and actors—these will stand though the heavens fall and hell itself should gape.

But there are others, hitherto impervious because they have not considered the evidence; who are lovers of Shakespeare and are interested in the problems raised by his life and work; who care for whatever things are true for the sake only of these things; who are attracted by the doubtful and mysterious—these it is that we want BACONIANA to reach, not the people whose minds are akin to that of the lady who said to Archbishop Whately "I don't understand it, your Grace, and I don't wish to understand it." To which the Archbishop replied, "Then, madam, I think you will succeed in not understanding it."

If those interested will carefully weigh the evidence so far recorded for the Baconian theory they will be first astonished by its force and then discover that there are

certain facts which cannot by any means be gainsaid. And they will discover too a significant thing, namely, that the man who, after enquiry and discrimination, reads Shakespeare and Bacon in the light of their single authorship never abandons it, never becomes revert or pervert from it, but continues in it convinced of its utter reason and truth.

‘Now if any Brother or Well-wisher shall conscientiously doubt or be dissatisfied, touching any particular Point contained in this Treatise, because of our speaking too many things in a little room: And if he or they shall be serious in so doing, and will be-friend us so far, and do us that courtesie, to send to us, before they condemn us, and let us know their scruples in a few words of writing, we shall look upon ourselves obliged both in affection and reason, to endeavour to give them full satisfaction.’

F.E.C.H.
W.S.M.

BEFORE THE ARMADA.

The following was recently quoted in *The Times* as a prayer of Queen Elizabeth's for England in peril of invasion by Spain and before the great naval victory over the Armada:

‘We do instantly beseech thee of thy gracious goodness, to be merciful to the Church militant here upon earth, and at this time compassed about with the most strong and subtle adversaries. O! let thine enemies know that thou hast received England, which they most of all for thy Gospel's sake do malign, into thine own protection. Set a wall about it, O Lord, and evermore mightily defend it. Let it be a comfort to the afflicted, a help to the oppressed, and a defence to thy Church and people persecuted abroad. And, forasmuch as this cause is new in hand, direct, and go before our armies both by land and sea. Bless them and prosper them, and grant unto them honourable success and victory. Thou art our help and shield. O! give good and prosperous success to all those that fight this battle against the enemies of thy Gospel. Amen.

BACON-SHAKESPEARE ANATOMY.

(PART VII.)

By W. S. MELSOME.

FROM what has been said in the last two issues of BACONIANA it should be clear that scarecrow laws, decrees dead to infliction, gangrenous laws, and obsolete laws that are grown into disuse, are one and the same; so, when "Shakespeare" writes "We must not make a scarecrow of the law" and Bacon says "*Above all things a gangrene in the laws is to be avoided*" (*De Aug. VIII, III, 57*) they mean the same thing; and their reasons are the same; namely, that they both bring about a want of respect; such as we see in seditions and rebellions, where "*The rebels that had shaken off the greater yoke of obedience had likewise cast away the lesser tie of respect*" (*Hist. Hen. VII*); but they are also "*like to infection,*" because they cause other laws to lose authority; for "*as an express statute is not regularly abrogated by disuse, it so happens that from a contempt of such as are obsolete, the other laws also lose part of their authority; whence follows that torture of Mezentius, whereby the living laws are killed in the embraces of the dead ones*" (*De Auh. VIII, III, 57*).

A similar torture occurs in a gangrene of the foot, whereby the living parts are killed by contact with the dead.

A gangrenous law, according to Bacon, is an obsolete law that has fallen into disuse, but which has not been repealed; and as a gangrene in the foot brings a gangrene to the more wholesome parts which are fit to be retained and put in execution; so, "*penal laws obsolete and out of use . . . bring a gangrene, neglect and habit of disobedience upon other wholesome laws which are fit to be retained in practice and execution*" (*Life VI, p. 65*). And as a gangrenous foot, if not cut off, doth mortify the more wholesome parts of the body; so, "*the cessation and abstinence to execute these unnecessary (obsolete) laws doth mortify the execution of such as are wholesome and most meet to be put in execution both for your Majesty's profit and the universal benefit of the realm*" (Bacon to Elizabeth, Works VII, p. 315).

note). And as we have seen in Coriolanus "The service of the foot being once gangrened is not then respected for what before it was"; so, too, the service of the law being once gangrened is no longer respected by the people.

Why did laws become "drowsy and neglected," "obsolete and out of use"? The answer is that

"There are some laws fit to be retained but their penalty too great" (*Life VI*, p. 65).

"O just but severe law (*Meas.*, *II*, 2, 41).

"And it is ever a rule that any over-great penalty (besides the acerbity of it) deadens the execution of the law." (*Life VI*, p. 65); and this is why we read of

"Decrees dead to infliction" (*I*. 3. 27).

"Obsolete laws that are grown into disuse." (*De Aug. VIII*. *III*. 57).

"Penal laws" . . . that "have been sleepers of long" (*Essay 56*).

"Laws . . . which for this fourteen* years we have let sleep." (*Meas.* *I*, 3, 19).

"The scarecrow law set 'up to fear the birds of prey' and allowed to 'keep one shape.' " (*Ib.* *II*, *I*, 1).

"The threatening twigs of birch" stuck "in their children's sight for terror, not to use." (*Ib.* *I*, 3, 24).

"All the enrolled penalties which have, like unscour'd armour, hung by the wall so long that nineteen zodiacs have gone round, and none of them been worn."

(*Ib.* *I*, 2, 170).

"The drowsy and neglected act." (*Ib.* *I*, 2, 174).

And, as already stated, "There is a further inconvenience of penal laws obsolete and out of use, for that it brings a gangrene, neglect and habit of disobedience," etc.; and "the lessening of authority in what degree soever must needs increase disobedience." (*Life III*, p. 380). And because of this disobedience, it comes about that,

"In time the rod becomes more mock'd than feared."

(*Meas.*, *I*, 3, 26).

"Liberty plucks justice by the nose."

(*Ib.*, *I*, 3, 29).

* First Folio; and "let slip" should obviously be "let sleep."

168 Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy.

The birds of prey make the scarecrow law "their perch, and not their terror." (*Ib.*, II, I, 2).

"The strong statutes stand, like the forfeits in a barber's shop, as much in mock as mark."

(*Ib.* V, I, 322).

And "pre-ordinance and first decree" are turned "into the law of children." (*J. Caesar*, III, I, 38).

"The baby beats the nurse and quite athwart goes all decorum."

(*Meas.*, I, 3, 30).

During the course of their legal training, Bacon and "Shakespeare" noticed that in the time of Henry VII there were a number of obsolete penal laws that had fallen into disuse, but had not been repealed; and because they had not been regularly abrogated by disuse, we may say, "these laws have not been dead though they have slept;" and for this same reason Angelo was justified in saying to Isabel "The law hath not been dead though it hath slept" (*Meas.*, II, 2, 90); and because these laws were only "sleepers" (*Ess.* 56) it was possible to awake them again, and this was what actually happened:—

"About this time began to be discovered in the king that disposition which afterwards, nourished and whet on by bad counsellors and ministers, proved the blot of his times; which was the course he took to crush treasure out of his subjects' purses, by forfeiture upon penal laws."

(*Works* VI, p. 155)

"The King had gotten for his purpose two instruments, Empsom and Dudley, whom the people esteemed as his horse-leeches and shearers." (*Ib.*, p. 217).

"Their principal working was upon penal laws, wherein they spared none great or small; nor considered whether the law were possible or impossible, in use or obsolete; but raked over all old and new statutes; though many of them were made with intention rather of terror than of rigour," (*Works*, VI, p. 219) yet they followed close the rigour of the statute to make Sir William Capel and others examples.

And just as Empsom and Dudley raked over all old statutes which had slept for many years, so Angelo

"awakes me all the enrolled penalties" which had slept for nineteen zodiacs, and "hath pick'd out an act" ("a drowsy and neglected act") "under whose heavy sense your brother's life falls into forfeit" (*Meas. I, 4, 64*); and, like Empson and Dudley, he cared not "*whether the law were possible or impossible, in use or obsolete*" and "*though many of them were made with intention rather of terror*" ("for terror not to use"—*Meas., I, 3, 26*) "*than of rigour*," yet he "follows close the rigour of the statute to make him (Claudio) an example" (*I, 4, 67*).

We see then that what happened in the bad times of Henry VII is made to happen again in "Measure for Measure."

Bacon and "Shakespeare" were anxious to get rid of all obsolete and ensnaring penal laws, so that the outrageous things that happened in the time of Henry VII (which Bacon says "were fitter to be buried than repeated") might never come about again; so Bacon wrote to Elizabeth and afterwards to James, and many times brought the matter before Parliament; and "Shakespeare" wrote 'Measure for Measure.'

First let us anatomize Bacon.

In 1595 he wrote: "*Look into the state of your laws and justice of your land; purge out multiplicity of laws, clear the uncertainty of them, repeal those that are snaring, and press the execution of those that are wholesome and necessary*" (*Life I, p. 339*).

What he wrote to Elizabeth in the following year is recorded above.

In 1601 he spoke "*for repealing of superfluous laws*" (*Life III, p. 19*). And again in 1614 amongst the bills to be offered to parliament he puts down "*An act giving authority to certain commissioners to review the state of the penal laws, to the end that such as are obsolete and snaring may be repealed.*" (*Life V, p. 15*).

"*In Athens they had sexviri (as Aeschines observeth) which were standing commissioners, who did watch to discern what laws waxed unproper for the time, and what new law did in any branch cross a former law, and so ex officio propounded their repeal.*" (*Life VII, p. 361*).

170 Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy.

Last but not least he wrote to King James: "*There are a number of ensnaring penal laws, which lie upon the subject; and if in bad times they should be awaked and put in execution, would grind them to powder.*" (Life VI, p. 65)r

"This new governor
Awakes me all the enrolled penalties
Which have, like unscour'd armour, hung by the wall
So long that nineteen zodiacs have gone round
And none of them been worn; and, for a name,
Now puts the drowsy and neglected act
Freshly on me" (Meas. I, 2, 169).

Now let us anatomize "Shakespeare."

He wrote a play which concerns itself with the science and art of "*the more public part of government, which is laws*" (Adv. II, 23, 49). And in this play he teaches us at least twelve different lessons; but his main object was to show to the world what mischief and injustice may ensue.

- (1) When judges are given too much discretion.
- (2) When "*that primary dignity of the law, certainty,*" is not preserved.
- (3) But, above all, what gross injustice may come about from neglecting to repeal *obsolete and ensnaring penal laws*.

Bacon begins his discourse upon government with the simple words "*Concerning government*" (Adv. II, 23, 48); but the play begins thus:

"Escalus.

"My lord.

"Of government the properties to unfold."

Because the duke thought, as Bacon did, that certain penal laws (such as that which condemned Claudio to death) were, beyond all reason, severe; he allowed them to fall into disuse and to sleep for fourteen years:—

"We have strict statutes and most biting laws . .

. . Which for this fourteen years we have let sleep."

(Meas. I, 3, 19).

And again, because he thought, as Bacon did, that "*judges . . especially in cases of laws penal, ought to have a care that that which was meant for terror be not turned into*

rigour" (Ess. 56) he retained them on the statute book, "like scarecrows," merely to intimidate the people, just "as fond fathers having bound up the threatening twigs of birch, only to stick it in their children's sight for terror, not to use" (*Meas. I, 3, 23*).

But he found that the people of Vienna got out of hand; and so did the children; so, according to the custom of the Athenians, and Bacon's recommendation, he appoints legal commissioners to '*take a review of these contrarieties in law*,' (*De Aug. VIII, III, 55*). Escalus, a common law judge, and Angelo, a judge of the chancery court, where mercy is, or should be, mixed with justice.

The first commissioner, Escalus, is chosen because he knows the nature of the people—a qualification which Bacon says such men ought to possess:—

"Unto princes and states, and especially towards wise senates and councils, the natures and dispositions of the people . . . ought to be . . . in great part clear and transparent." (*Adv. II, 23, 48*).

The nature of our people,
Our city's institutions, and the terms
For common justice, you're as pregnant in,
As art and practice hath enriched any
That we remember.' (*Meas. I, 1, 10*).

The duke is also given to understand that Escalus is a master of the science of "*the more public part of government, which is laws*" (*Adv. II, 23, 49*), and therefore needs no instruction regarding his office; so he passes over this part in silence as Bacon did while writing to King James upon the same subject,—"*Considering that I write to a king that is a master of this science, and is so well assisted, I think it decent to pass over this part in silence.*"

(*Adv. II, 23, 48*).

"Since I am put to know that your own science
Exceeds, in that, the lists of all advice
My strength can give you: then no more remains,
But that to your sufficiency . . .
. as your worth is able,
And let them work.'" (*I, 1, 5*).

172 Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy.

After the word "sufficiency" there is something omitted: something which the duke passes over in silence as "*one that knew how to hold his peace*" (*Adv. II*, 23, 48). But "*judges ought to remember thae their office is . . . to interpret lawes*" (*Essay* 56), and this is what Escalus has to do, to the best of his ability (as his worth is able), "and let them work"; i.e., see they be put in execution, and not allowed to become mere "scarecrows" or "dead to infliction"; for, "*above all things a gangrene in the lawes is to be avoided*" (*De Aug. VIII*, III, 57).

The other commissioner, Angelo; a 'learned,' 'wise' and 'austere' man, is withdrawn from a life of contemplation on the ground that

"*contemplation is a dream,*" (*Life I*, p. 381),
and

"*to think well is little better than to dream well*"
(*Antitheta*);

and as

"*good thoughts, though God accept them, are little better than good dreams except they be put in act*"
(*Essay XI*),

"Be great in act as you have been in thought"

(*K. John*, V, I, 45);

"For if our virtues did not go forth of us, 'twere all alike as if we had them not" (*Meas*, I, I, 34);

"For what is your virtue if you show it not?"

(*Life I*, p. 333).

"Heaven doth with us as we with torches do, not light them for themselves."

(*Meas. I*, I, 33).

"Neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light to all that are in the house." (*Matt. V*, 15).

"How far that little candle throws his beams!
So shines a good deed in a naughty world."

(*M. of V.*, V, I, 90).

And as "*good thoughts are little better than good dreams except they be put in act, and that cannot be without power and place.*" (*Essay XI*);

Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy. 173

"I have delivered to lord Angelo . . . my absolute power and place, here in Vienna"

(*Meas.*, I, 3, 11);

"that he may let his light so shine before men that they may see his good works"

(*Matt.* V. 16);

"For spirits are not finely touched but to fine issues"

(*Meas.*, I, 1, 36).

"The king's most excellent majesty . . . hath thought fit not to leave you these talents to be employed upon yourself only, but to call you to serve himself and his people."

(*Life VI*, p. 201).

"Thyself and thy belongings

Are not thine own so proper, as to waste

Thyself upon thy virtues, they on thee."

(*Meas.* I, 1, 30).

"Sure, he that made us with such large discourse,

Looking before and after, gave us not

That capability and god-like reason

To fust in us unused"

(*Ham.* IV, 4, 36); and

"I do think every man in his particular bound to help the commonwealth the best he may"

(*Life III*, p. 19).

And as man is not made for himself only; so, "everything in nature seems not made for itself, but for man" . . . "for all things are made subservient to man, and he receives use and benefit from them all" (Bacon's *Prometheus*); thus "nature . . . determines herself the glory of a creditor, both thanks and use" (*Meas.*, I, 1, 37-41).

The reason, then, for appointing Angelo as chief commissioner was, that he should not hide his talents in a napkin, nor his light under a bushel. But there was another reason. The duke was a student of Tacitus, and remembered his opinions (1) "That the raising of the fortune seldom mendeth the disposition," and (2) "that Vespasian alone of the emperors changed for the better" (after coming to power) (*Adv.* II, 22, 5); so he puts Angelo in power to test these opinions, and "to practise his judgment with the disposition of natures" (*Meas.*, III, 1, 165); i.e., to see if the judge's robe changes Angelo's purpose, or, "not chang-

174 Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy.

ing heart with habit'' (*Ib.*, V, 1, 389) he remains the same man:—

‘‘Hence shall we see

If power change purpose what our seemers be’’*

(*Ib.*, I, 3, 54).

The result of the test, spoken of above, confirms the opinion of Tacitus; for Angelo’s first act after coming to power is one of cruelty. He awakes a law that had slept for fourteen years, and which had, therefore, come to have an uncertain sense; and, under it, condemns Claudio to death without any warning whatever. Now, *‘certainty is so essential to a law, that a law without it cannot be just; for if the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle? So, if a law has an uncertain sense who shall obey it? A law, therefore, ought to give warning before it strikes.’* (*De Aug. VIII*, III, 8).

Bacon continued:—

‘‘And it is a true maxim, that the best law leaves least to the breast of the judge; which is effected by certainty.’’

(*Ib.*)

And it is interesting to note that Angelo leaves nothing to his own breast when he says to Isabel:

‘‘It is the law not I condemns your brother.’’

(*Meas. II*, 2, 80).

As to popularity:—

‘‘I wish you to take heed of popularity’’

(*Life VI*, p. 211).

‘‘I love the people,

But do not like to stage me to their eyes:

Though it do well, I do not relish well

Their loud applause and Aves vehement

Nor do I think the man of safe discretion

That does affect it’’

(*Meas.*, I, 1, 68);

for *‘‘A popular judge is a deformed thing, and plaudites are fitter for players than for magistrates. Do good to the people, love them, and give them justice’’*

(*Life VI*, p. 211).

* Cf. ‘‘Sure this robe of mine does change my disposition’’ (*W. Tale*, IV. 4, 135); and the ‘power’ and the ‘purpose’ are not far away.

Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy. 175

Bacon is here speaking to judges; and the man who, in *Measure for Measure*, says 'I love the people' is again one judge speaking to another judge; true, he does not tell him to love the people, but has already given him this injunction:—

"Mortality and mercy in Vienna
Live in thy tongue and heart."

(I, I, 45).

And although

"We have strict statutes and most biting laws,
The needful bits and curbs to headstrong steeds."

(I, 3, 19);

"Nevertheless, I would not have you headstrong, but
heartstrong."

(Life VI, p. 201).

"I pass from the general duties of a judge . . . to the
things that concern the proprieties of your place."

(Life VII, p. 104).

Although the duke thinks it unnecessary to give Escalus and Angelo advice touching the execution of their place, the first thing they do, when the duke takes his leave of them, is to follow Bacon's directions in his essay "Of Great Place":—

"Embrace and invite helps and advices touching the
execution of thy place."

Escalus:

"It concerns me

To look into the bottom of my place;
A power I have, but of what strength and nature
I am not yet instructed."

(I, I, 79).

Angelo:

"'Tis so with me. Let us withdraw together
And we may soon our satisfaction have
Touching that point."

The author of the play, therefore, makes these two men take counsel together, that they may become "*Negotiis pares . . . and execute their places with sufficiency.*"

(Essay 55).

(To be continued).

FRANCIS BACON AT CAMBRIDGE.

AMONG the pupils of Whitgift at Trinity College, Cambridge, were Anthony and Francis Bacon, Edward Coke, and Essex. Whitgift's reputation as a favourite at Court, and the wide recognition of his services to the State Church, enabled him to rule the College practically as a dictator, but he proved a successful administrator.

He kept ledgers showing his accounts with his pupils, and one of these is extant. He seems to have advanced them money for anything and everything—commons, furniture, books, stationery, clothes, and repairs to these, medical and dentist's fees, nursing, and even the keep of horses.

An example of one of these accounts is that of the brothers Anthony and Francis Bacon, who went up to Trinity College in April, 1573, Francis being then only a little over twelve years of age, and shared rooms with their friend Edward Tyrrell; they had with them a servant named Griffith, and their bill is for the half year from April 6th 1573, to the following Michaelmas.

	l.	s.	d.
receavyd	xxvj	xiiij	iiij
layd owt for certain stufte as appearyth			
by a certain byll		xliij	j
for half a wekes comon		vij	vj
titus livius		viij	vj
ciceronis rheto		iiij	
olynthi. orati. demost.			xij
Ilias hom. 2. gre.		iiij	viiij
comenta. cesaris		ij	
3 pare of shoes for antho..		iiij	vj
2 pare for frances		ij	
2 pare terrell		ij	4
candell		iiij	
brekfasts the .9. of may		x	
for anthonie beeing syck		xij	vj
more in the tyme of his syknes		v	vj
more in his syknes		x	iiij
.3. pare of shoes		iiij	
bringng a cloke bagg from london			xij

.2. boes (and arrowes struck through)	iiij	viiij
arrowes	v	ij
shoting gloves and a braser		vj
ij quivers	ij	
there matriculation	vj	
carrieng bokes from London		xviiij
arrowes for mr terrill		xviiij
3. pare of shoes	iiij	iiij
laundres at myd	viiij	
two pare of garters	v	
lector at myd	iiij	
for .2. horsshier goeng to redgrave .7.		
dayes	ix	iiij
for dressing horsse and horssemeat at		
my .1. northes at redgrave &c	ij	x
.2. dosen poynts		xij
breakefasts	viiij	
vj pare of shoes	vj	iiij
mending a dublet for antho.		vj
mending a gowne for terrell		vj
mending curtans		vj
paper and ynck		x
oyle for frances neck		xij
concerve of barberies		x
aumont mylke		viiij
for other meate when he was syck	iiij	4
.2. tables for there studies	x	
.2. deskes	vj	
co. and syz. the.29. maii	iiij	xv
.2. lodes of coles	xxx	j
(16l.17s.11d.)		
.3. pare of shoes	iiij	viiij
cutting of wood		vj
.2. pownd candell		vj
to the potiquarie when frances was syck	iiij	
for meate for fraunces beeng syck	iiij	iiij
for breakfasts .6. dayes	ij	
comons 28 aug. antho.	liiij	xj
fraunces	lj	ob.
tyrrell	l	ix

178 Francis Bacon at Cambridge.

lector at mihel		iiij	
laundres		viiij	
tutor	iiiij		
one pare of belloes		iiij	
2 dosen poyntes			xvj
(25 <i>l</i> .8 <i>s</i> .7 <i>d</i> . ob.)			
a tinder box			vj
candell			vj
a lock for there woodhowse			xvj
a stone Jugg			i
shoes for antho.			xvj
fraunces			xiiij
tyrrell			xv
an earthen pan			iiij
for entring into comons	viiij		
tullies workes		xxx	
2. aristotells		xxxvj	
.2. platoes		xxiiij	
one comentarie of tullies orations		xiiij	
one zenophon gre. and latin		xviiij	
one salust			xvj
one lode of wood		vj	
(19 <i>l</i> .9 <i>s</i> .9 <i>d</i> . 44 <i>l</i> 18 <i>s</i> .4 <i>d</i> .)			

Tyrrell went down in 1574, and the Bacons at Christmas 1575. During their last term the two brothers economised rigidly on books, and so, in spite of some expenditure on luxuries, they had as much as £10 13*s*. 0*d*. to their credit when they left. But what is more interesting is the fact that at twelve years of age Bacon was reading the *Iliad* of Homer in Greek, and Zenophon in Greek and Latin.

It will be seen that he paid a visit to Lord North at Redgrave, hiring two horses to go there at a cost of 9/4, and these horses consumed horse-meat value 2/10.

The name of Lord North suggests the name of Sir Thomas North, who was then translating Plutarch's *Lives*, to be published in 1579.

Philemon Holland, the translator of Pliny's *Natural History*, was a minor Fellow of Trinity College in 1573, and a Major Fellow in 1574, and was therefore at the College all the time that Bacon was there.

THE SHORTER POEMS OF SHAKSPERE.

TO the poet of *Venus and Adonis*, *Lucrece* and *certain Sonnets to sundry notes of music* have also been ascribed the following verses which are less famous.

Shakspere of Stratford lived upon friendly terms with the leading citizens and well-to-do gentry of the town and he figures traditionally as a writer of their epitaphs. By the memory of one Elias James, his Poetic Genius is said to have been thus inspired:—

An Epitaph.

*When god was pleas'd ye world onwilling yet
Elias James to nature payd his debt
And here repositeth; as he liv'd he dyde
The saying in him strongly vere-fi'de
Such life such death yea ye known truth to tell
He liv'd a godly life and dy'de as well.*

WM. SHAKESPEARE.

More familiar is the epitaph upon one John Combe of Stratford-upon-Avon, ‘‘a notable Userer, fastened upon a tomb that he had caused to be built in his life time.’’

*Ten in the hundred must lie in his graue,
But a hundred to ten whether God will him haue?
Who then must be interr'd in this Tombe?
Oh (quoth the Dieull) my John a Combe.*

Aubrey gives a somewhat different reading of what he describes as this extemporary Epitaph.

*Ten in the Hundred the Devill allowes
But Combes will have twelve, he sweares and vowes:
If anyone askes who lies in this Tombe:
Hoh! quoth the Devill, 'Tis my John o' Combe.*

And Rowe referring to Shakspere's particular Intimacy with this Mr. Combe, ‘‘an old Gentleman noted for his

180 Shorter Poems of Shakspeare.

wealth and Usury'' provides yet another version. He writes that ''It happen'd that in a pleasant Conversation amongst their comunon Friends Mr. *Combe* told Shakespear in a laughing manner, that he fancy'd, he intended to write his Epitaph, if he happen'd to out-live him; and since he could not know what might be said of him when he was dead, he desir'd it might be done immediately: Upon which Shakespear gave him these four Verses''—Dr. Dover Wilson has not yet considered the problem of their transmission!

*Ten in the Hundred lies here ingrav'd
'Tis a Hundred to Ten, his Soul is not sav'd:
If any Man ask, Who lies in this Tomb?
Oh! ho! quoth the Devil, 'tis my John-a-Combe.*

By John Combe's will of 1613 Shakspeare was bequeathed a legacy and it would therefore seem that Rowe was wrong in stating that ''the sharpness of the Satyr is said to have stung the Man so severely that he never forgave it.'' In either case, ''being dead, and making the poore his heiery hee (Shakspeare) after wrightes this for his epitaph.

*How ere he lieued Judge not
John Combe shall neuer be forgott
While poor, hath Memmorye, for he did gather
To make the poore his Issue; hee their father
As record of his tilth and seede
Did Crowne him In his Latter deede.
Finis: W. Shak.*

John's brother Tom died not uncommemorated by Shakspeare: Tom a Combe was known as Thin-Beard according to Francis Peck of Trinity Cambridge, a Leicestershire clergyman and prebendary of Lincoln, and the latter tells us that everybody knew of the epitaph for John but this was never printed:—

*Thin in beard, and thick in purse:
Never man beloved worse:
He went to th'grave with many a curse:
The Devil and He had both one nurse.*

''This,'' commented the Rev. Peck, ''is very sour.''

Shorter Poems of Shakspeare. 181

Another characteristic epitaph is said to have been begun for "Mr. Wm: Shake-speare Being Merrye att Tauern by Mr. Ben: Johnson."

*Here lies Ben Johnson that was once one who giving yt
to Mr. Shakspear to make upp presently wrightes.*

*Who while hee liu'de was a sloe thinge
and now being dead is Nothinge.*

finis.

There is an interesting variation of this text which has somehow escaped the attention of editors. "Shakspr took the pen," it is said, "and made this"

*Here lies Benjamin—with short hair upon his chin—
Who while he lived was a slow thing—and now he's
buried is no thing.*

The celebrated lampoon upon Sir Thomas Lucy follows: the verses "reveal the Shakespearian touch."

*Sir Thomas was too covetous,
To covet so much deer
When horns enough upon his head
Most plainly do appear.
Had not his worship one deer left?
What then? he had a wife
Took pains enough to find him horns
Should last him all his life.*

There is another version, apparently the real first heir of the young Shakspeare's invention, said to have been affixed by the poet to Sir Thomas' park gate which enraged the baronet to such a degree that Shakspeare thought it prudent to quit Stratford.

*A Parliament member, a justice of peace,
At home a poor scare-crow, at London an asse,
If lousy is Lucy as some volk miscall it,
Then Lucy is lousy whatever befall it.
He thinks himself great,
Yet an asse in his state,
We allow by his ears but with asses to mate:
For if Lucy is lousy, as some volk miscall it,
Then sing lousy Lucy, whatever befall it.*

182 Shorter Poems of Shakspeare.

Finally we have Shakspeare's own epitaph which he directed should be engraved upon his own tomb and was obeyed and there it remains to this day.

*Good friend for Jesus sake forbear
To digg the dust enclosed heare:
Blest be ye man yt spares thes stones
And curst be he yt moves my bones.*

And this apparently was the last of the Shorter Poems attributed to William Shakspeare of Stratford-upon-Avon, Gent.

“THE SCHOLARSHIP BOGEY.”

By H. KENDRA BAKER.

ANYONE who has had experience of newspaper correspondence on the Authorship question will be well aware that, sooner or later, the point will be taken that the Baconian theory must be nonsense, seeing that no “Scholars” can be cited in its support.

This point is usually made at the tail-end of a correspondence after the Stratfordian protagonist has been rather badly worsted in the general argument, and is, figuratively, a sort of final broadside before withdrawing with colours flying from the Engagement.

Indeed, not seldom, it is followed by the Editorial fiat “This Correspondence is now closed,” from which the reader is intended, presumably, to infer that there is nothing more to be said—the “Scholars” have saved the situation!

Now, who are these “Scholars?” Well, we are assisted in our enquiry by knowing who they are *not*. In a fairly recent correspondence when, as usual, this point cropped up, and it was asked, “Can any Baconian produce the name of any Scholar who believes that Bacon wrote the plays?” we were favoured with the following explanatory note: “When I say ‘scholar’ I do not mean Ignatius Donnelly, Delia Bacon, the Rev. B. G. Theobald—” (our late, and deeply lamented, President) “—Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence (the author, as Professor C. H. Herford said, of ‘the silliest book ever written’) or Looney.”

So now we know who are *not* Scholars—in the estimation of the Stratfordian—but surely it would have been much simpler and more comprehensive had he excluded from such a title—as, of course, he intended to do—all Shakespearean students and writers holding unorthodox views on the authorship question.

Now, this “scholarship bogey” is designed to impress

184 "The Scholarship Bogey."

the man-in-the-street, and to frighten off the independent enquirer by trading on an inferiority complex.

Who, then, are these "Scholars" who still uphold the tradition? Presumably the "professional" variety is referred to, men who hold their appointments as Professors of English Literature in our seats of learning. Does anyone imagine they would hold those positions for five minutes if they were not "orthodox?" They were taught the tradition, brought up on it, and live by it; they teach it, write upon it and defend it. So long as they stick to it they are orthodox and "Scholars," relinquish it and—outer darkness is their portion!

Let us visualise—if we can—the fate of the would-be Professor who, on presenting himself as a candidate to the Powers that be at any University, should inform them that he is a disciple of Von Schlegel who, so long ago as 1808, considered "all that has been said about him (Shakspere) personally to be a mere fable, a blind extravagant error."*

What horror and uplifting of hands and eyes! What impassioned cries of "Away with him!"

Is it so very remarkable, therefore, that if "Scholarship" implies orthodoxy, "Scholars" are not tumbling over each other to proclaim themselves Baconians? In point of fact it would be far more remarkable if any "Scholar" or Professor on the active list were bold enough even to hint at such a belief; for, were he to do so, his "activity" in such state of life would be incontinently terminated!

Surely it is obvious that an unorthodox Professor of English Literature in "colleges and places where they learn" would be as striking a phenomenon as a Moslem in the Chair of Divinity at a Theological Seminary!

Thus, so far as "Scholars" on the active list are concerned, it is perfectly natural that there should be no Baconians among them.

Of those on the "retired list," there may, of course, be another story to tell—but only, be it said, if they are

* Schlegel's "Dramatic Art and Literature."

independent of “retired pay!” The writer was almost stunned not long ago on hearing a now safely retired Professor refer to the traditional author as “that clown!” But, even among such, it is hardly to be supposed that those who, may be for years, have sedulously fed and watered the Stratfordian belief are likely in later years to stultify their own teaching and give themselves away as blind leaders of the blind.

No: one may almost say, “once a Professor always a Professor”; and thus why should anyone expect to discover any but orthodox “Scholars” and Professors.

To lament their absence from our ranks would be foolish, for they do not belong there.

But the term “Scholars” is intended to cover a wider class than merely those Professors whose emoluments are—or have been—dependent on their orthodoxy. It is intended to apply to “great names” in the world of letters, and is designed to have the psychological effect of crushing argument by sheer weight of orthodoxy. But when these names are analysed it will be found that they fall into various classes: (1) Those whose writings ante-date the first presentation of the Baconian case; (2) Those who have adopted the principle against which Paley has so urgently warned us—“contempt prior to examination”; and (3) Those who decline even to consider the evidences.

It has been well said that we have acquired more knowledge in the last fifty years than in the preceding five hundred. Other books have been published besides “Hero-Worship!” Many views of Shakespeare have been substituted for Carlyle’s Warwickshire Peasant, current and accepted 80 years ago, and many a view current and accepted to-day may be on the scrap-heap 80 years hence. Knowledge is progressive—even Stratfordians must admit that!

The whole point is, What consideration—if any—have they given to the Baconian arguments? Have they dismissed them, as Sir Sidney Lee did, as having “no rational right to a hearing,” and as “madhouse chatter?” Have they deemed them beneath the dignity of “Scholar-

186 "The Scholarship Bogey."

ship?" Have they simply ignored them and relied on the tenacity of tradition?

Of what possible value can an opinion be that is based on a blindly accepted tradition, unexamined and unquestioned?

How different for example is the opinion of F. J. Furnivall on the question from that of W. E. Gladstone.

The former, in 1877, in his preface to "The Leopold Shakspeare," writes:—

"The idea of Lord Bacon's having written Shakspeare's plays can be entertained only by folk who know nothing whatever of either writer, or are crackt, or who enjoy the paradox or joke. . . . I doubt whether any so idiotic suggestion had ever been made before, or will ever be made again, with regard to either Bacon or Shakspeare. The tomfoolery of it is infinite."

Here we have the view of the Stratfordian protagonist "who lived and moved and had his being" by his orthodoxy.

Gladstone, on the other hand—a scholar, if ever there was one, though not living by his Scholarship—is content, in 1889, thus to deliver himself:

"Considering what Bacon was, I have always regarded your discussion as one perfectly serious and to be respected."

Furnivall is accounted one of the great ones of the literary world; his ignorance of the arguments can be gauged by his confident and flamboyant denunciation of the hypothesis.

Gladstone—one need hardly say—does not figure as a "Scholar" in this connection!

The truth is that this "Scholarship bogey" is limited in its efficacy to those who have never taken the trouble to analyse the conditions under which "Scholarship" has been exemplified; or to those upon whom "great names" have a sort of hypnotic influence.

In these days of mass psychology, Stratford is a creed into which the merits of probability, or even possibility, do not enter. It is the national teaching, and thousands

of embryo "Professors" are being turned out, fortified with all the rites of the Education Syllabus, to perpetuate that creed and to defend it against the infidel! The "faith" has been instilled into them from their earliest childhood; it is fostered in the preparatory and public school; and when they pass on to the University, they are still privileged to worship at the Stratford Shrine under the tutelage of Professors who pride themselves upon their orthodoxy.

What place is there in this hierarchy for a Baconian Professor? Just as the image-makers of Ephesus cried, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" so the "Professors" cry, "Great is Will Shakespeare of the Stratfordians!" for their sale of images is threatened by iconoclasts.

It is only in later years that the student develops the critical faculty. There are, of course, cases in which it develops earlier, and then we hear all about it at Union Debates! But, generally speaking, it is when the student begins to think for himself that he seeks to substitute reason for authority. One could fill a volume with the names of those who, in various walks of life—notably the legal profession—have risen to eminence, but whose names figure not in the realms of "scholarship," for the good and sufficient reason that they have rejected the Stratford pretensions! Frequently they are men who have attained to eminence by their strength of character, their sound judgment, their outstanding ability to weigh evidence, their practical, as distinguished from their academic, qualifications.

If the opinions of all these men could be marshalled on the Baconian side there would be no lack of true scholarship manifested; but so long as that much abused term is confined to those only who profess the orthodox faith, we must be content to describe by some other name these great statesmen, lawyers and professional men who are denied the title of "Scholar."

Let us conclude with the opinion of one of them, Sir James Plaisted Wilde, Lord Penzance, formerly Dean of the Arches:—

"It is desperately hard, nay, impossible, to believe that this uninstructed, untutored youth, as he came from Stratford, should have written these plays; and it is almost as hard, as it seems to me, to believe that he should have rendered himself capable of writing them by elaborate study afterwards. . . . The difficulty of imagining this young man to have converted himself in a few years from a state bordering on ignorance into a deeply read student, master of French and Italian, as well as of Greek and Latin, and capable of quoting and borrowing largely from writers in all these languages, is almost insuperable. . . . His name once removed from the controversy, there will not, I think, be much question as to the lawyer to whose pen the Shakespeare plays are to be attributed." (The Bacon-Shakspeare Controversy, a Judicial Summing-up," 1903.)

This from a man who was considered one of the most enlightened lawyers of his day and renowned for his ability in marshalling evidence should go far to demolish the myth that true Scholars are not to be found in the Baconian ranks.

THE LEARNED PIG.

A BOOK, the author of which was stated to be an Officer of the Royal Navy, bearing this strange title, was published in London in 1786.

"The Story of the Learned Pig," to give the book its full title, was referred to by Dr. W. H. Prescott, in "American Baconiana," February, 1923, with a photograph of its frontispiece and pages 38 and 39 reproduced.

The book tells the story of the many reincarnations which "The Learned Pig" can remember, and at the beginning he says that his first recollection is that as Romulus. On page 37 we read the following:—

"I soon after contracted a friendship with that great man and first of geniuses, the 'Immortal Shakespeare,' and am happy in now having it in my power to refute the prevailing opinion of his having run his country for deer-stealing, which is as false as it is disgracing. The fact is, Sir, that he had contracted an intimacy with the wife of a country justice near Stratford, from his having extolled her beauty in a common ballad; and was unfortunately, by his worship himself, detected in a very awkward situation with her. Shakespeare, to avoid the consequences of this discovery, thought it most prudent to decamp. This I had from his mouth."

The pages reproduced in facsimile read:—

"With equal falsehood has he been father'd with many spurious dramatic pieces. 'Hamlet,' 'Othello,' 'As you like it,' 'The Tempest,' and 'Midsummer's Night Dream,' for five; of all which I confess myself to be the author. And that I should turn poet is not to be wondered at, since nothing is more natural than to contact the ways and manners of those with whom we live in habits of strict intimacy.

"You will of course expect me to say something of the comments that have been made by various hands on these works of mine and his: but the fact is, they all

run so wide of the real sense, that it would be hard to say who has erred most.

"In this condition I for some time enjoyed an uninterrupted happiness, living at my ease on the profits of my stage-pieces, and what I got by horse-holding. But, alas! how transient is all human felicity! The preference given to Shakespeare over me, and the great countenance shewn him by the first crowned head in the world, and all people of taste and quality, threw me into so violent a fit of the spleen, that it soon put a period to my existence."

The recollection of the Learned Pig's incarnation as Romulus is also interesting. In *BACONIANA*, July 1898, there is an article entitled "RESURRECTIO DIVI QUIRINI FRANCISCI BACONI," etc., and on the next page there is a reproduction of forty distichs in Latin, entitled "IN OBITUM INCOMPARABILIS FRANCISCO DE VERULAMIO." "They are all highly instructive," writes Dr. Prescott, "and correspondingly important; but I wish to call your special attention to only one,—the 17th:

"Crescere Pegaseas docuit, velut hasta Quirini
Crevit, et exiguo tempore Laurus erat."

The translation as given is: "He taught them to grow, as the shaft of Quirinus once grew to a bay-tree."

Whether or not this translation is absolutely correct is not material to the point I wish to make, which is that the word "Quirinus" in its etymological meaning is **THE SPEAR SHAKER** or **SHAKESPEARE!** Quirinus was also the nickname of Romulus, because he cast or threw a spear into the Quirinal. Thus we have a second reference to The Learned Pig being Shakespeare; for he says he was Romulus,—Romulus was Quirinus,—and Quirinus was Shakespeare!

REVIEWS.

SHAKESPEARE'S MESSAGE FOR ENGLAND AT WAR, by G. Wilson Knight. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1s. net.

THE substance of this essay was first given at a lecture recital to the People's National Theatre by the author, who is Chancellors' Professor of English, Trinity College, Toronto. It is divided into four sections: (a) What England is, (b) How England should act, (c) What England must oppose and (d) What England stands for. Quotations from Shakespeare are grouped accordingly and it may be interesting to compare these with the ideas of Francis Bacon.

Thus we are invited to notice all the way through Shakespeare's vivid feeling for essential royalty. His conception of true royalty is very close to his conception of divinity; indeed, he sees one as an attempt to attune man's troubled existence on earth directly to the other.

This feeling is expressed again and again by Bacon, the identity running even into minor details. "It is not without a mystery that the first King that was instituted by God was translated from a shepherd. Allegiance of subjects to hereditary monarchs is the work of the law of nature." Thus Bacon in his speech on the Post Nati made in 1608, and in the following year, in "*Troilus and Cressida*" iii, 3, appears a reference to this same mystery with which "relation durst never meddle, in the soul of state."

Shakespeare by Professor Wilson Knight then tells us What England is in the rousing words of *King John*. As an island—both Bacon and Shakespeare were very conscious of England as an island and both used exactly the same metaphor for the sea encircling it as our wall and bulwark—England to itself must rest true. Faulconbridge's words sound in our ears as a trumpet. A little quieter than that, jotted into Bacon's *Promus*, we find "I prefer nothing, but that they be true to themselves, and I true to myself and in "*Of Wisdom for a Man's Self*" "Be as

true to thyself as thou be not false to others, especially to thy King and Country.'" In the portraits of his Kings Shakespeare shows us different aspects of England. Henry IV cries in his sleepless unrest "Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown" and Bacon comments in his *Essay of Empire* that "it is a miserable state of mind to have few things to desire and many things to fear; and yet that commonly is the case of Kings."

Of course in *How England should Act* we have Henry V as an inspiring leader before Harfleur and the mettle of his soldiers. Curiously both writers think of soldiers as *iron*. "This island of Britain hath the best *iron* in the world, that is, the best soldiers in the world." Bacon "makes no question" and Shakespeare's Henry V with "an aspect of *iron*" frightens ladies when he comes to woo as another "*iron* man" cheered a rout of rebels with his drum in 2 Hy. IV. iv. 2.

England must oppose the unlawful and undisciplined craving for power. Richard III is a warning. It is remarkable that in spite of the great diversity of contemporary opinion regarding the character and career of this King, Bacon and Shakespeare were in complete agreement that he killed Henry VI with his own hand, contrived the death of his brother Clarence, and was responsible for the murder of the young princes in the Tower: both had doubts as to the fate of his wife.

It is in *Timon of Athens* that the princely and generous hero denounces the greed and social rottenness of humanity, the smiling, smooth, detested parasites . . . trencher friends, time's flies. The play first published in 1623 undoubtedly expresses Bacon's first reactions to his Fall—later he attained resignation and complete serenity of mind—and it echoes curiously the reference (*Advancement of Learning* 1603-5) to "those trencher philosophers, which in the later age of the Roman state, were usually in the house of great persons, being little better than solemn parasites."

Professor Wilson Knight quite justly emphasises that mercy is part of Shakespeare's understanding of God and is necessary to any true royalty. He quotes *Measure for*

Measure and of course the *Merchant of Venice*. We think of Francis Bacon to whom the state and bread of the poor was always precious: who hated all unkindness and hardness of heart and who knew that pity for distress is one of the crowning glories of human character: this alone he ascribes to the chief Personage of his ideal *New Atlantis*— "he had an aspect as if he pitied men"— and in the world of action we hear him in the splendid words of a decree on the Praemunire controversy "For as much as mercy and justice be the true supporters of our royal throne . . . and that our subjects, when their case deserveth to be relieved in course of equity, should not be abandoned and exposed to perish under the rigor and extremity of the law" etc.

Professor Wilson Knight has written with brilliant insight of the imaginative interpretation of the Shakespeare plays. It is remarkable that the nearer one approaches the heart and mind of Shakespeare the stronger the conviction grows that they are the heart and mind of Francis Bacon.

THE BAD QUARTO OF HAMLET, a critical study by George Ian Duthie, M.A., Ph.D., Cambridge University Press, 10s. net.

Dr. Duthie's contribution to what Dr. Greg in his Foreword describes as a subject of speculation and controversy which have so far proved inconclusive and unilluminating certainly offers no final solution, nor indeed any solution, of the problems raised by "A booke called the Revenge of Hamlett, Prince of Denmarke, as yt was latelie Acted by the Lord Chamberleyne his servantes," entered thus in the Stationers' Register on the 26th July, 1602, and published the next year with the following title page "The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke By William Shake-speare. As it hath beene diverse times acted by His Highnesse servantes in the Cittie of London: as also in the two Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, and elsewhere."

Dr. Duthie believes that the text of this famous, or

rather infamous. First Quarto, as it has been called, postdates those of the Second Quarto which (without further entry, 'Newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much againe as it was, according to the true and perfect Coppie') appeared in 1604 and of the First Folio, practically everything in it depending upon the full Shakespearian text of Quarto 2 or a stage version of it. Moreover Quarto 1 is a memorial reconstruction made for provincial performance by an actor who was able, when his memory failed him, to write blank verse of his own in which he quoted reminiscences from other plays, his work being at times revised and amplified by his own and another hand. At other points he incorporated phraseology and characteristics of a pre-Shakespearian *Hamlet*, for the existence of which Dr. Duthie thinks there is good evidence, i.e., the address of Nashe prefixed to Greene's '*Menaphon*.' This was published in 1589 and attacked a group of writers with common characteristics, bringing Kyd under fire and also the author of the *Hamlet* play. But this author, whoever he was, was not Shakespeare.

We have Dr. Duthie's word for that.

Henslowe records a performance of *Hamlet* in 1594, but we are told this is too early to suppose it is Shakespearian, or even partly so; we must infer that it was a revival of the old *Hamlet* to which Nashe referred.

It is remarkable that except for a single disparaging reference in a note to page 263, Dr. Duthie ignores the work of Dr. A. S. Cairncross, who in '*The Problem of Hamlet; a Solution*,' while agreeing that the First Quarto is a product of memory, contends that there is no foundation whatever for the theory of the existence of a pre-Shakespearian *Hamlet* by Kyd or another and that the *Hamlet* to which Nashe referred in 1589 was Shakespeare's play as we have it. If Dr. Cairncross is right the whole structure of Shakespearian chronology, the pride and corner stone of orthodox criticism and commentary, is threatened and must be revised, a prospect which might well have appalled Dr. Duthie, and, as many will think, if *Hamlet* as we now have the play had been written some time before 1589, it has been staged in London in 1585

and in Antwerp in 1586, in which year Shakspeare of Stratford was twenty-two years of age, the latter could not have written it, whoever else did. This conclusion had, of course, to be avoided at all costs, although there is nothing whatever to cast doubt upon but very much to confirm the Baconian authorship at that date, and therefore are postulated the pre-Shakespearian *Hamlet* and the pirate player who could write shorthand, whose memory played him the strangest pranks and who took ten months to do his nefarious work.

We will indicate shortly why we think Dr. Duthie and Dr. Cairncross are wrong in considering that Quarto 1 is a memory perversion of the true and original text. In the first place, of course, there is the difference of names; Polonious becoming Corambis and his servant Reynaldo, Montano. The player King and Queen of the later text become a Duke and a Duchess, their lines differing so widely that it seems impossible to regard Quarto 1 as bad reporting. Again there is a striking difference between the two versions in the arrangement of the scenes and the great soliloquy "To be or not to be" is so garbled as to be an unrecognisable version of the later text. A mere blunder in the sequence of scenes in Quarto 1 is impossible because this sequence is quite satisfactory and, if there were no blunder and if the arrangement of scenes in the later text is the original one, the pirate player must have carefully changed Shakespeare's sequence and re-arranged the scenes himself, a supposition which is incredible. Further, there is a scene between Horatio and the Queen in Quarto 1 which shows a different interpretation of the latter's character from that of the later text, a point to which we shall return. The First Quarto contains passages which are not to be found in the Second at all and the archaic verse of the former when compared with the elaboration and comparative perfection of the later text indicates in our view that nothing but the intervention of a comparatively long period in the life of the author can account for the difference in the two versions.

A critical examination of the whole text is, of course, beyond our scope; we think that Quarto 1 the text of which

presents no conclusive evidence of piracy whatever, is not a garbling nor a shortening of Quarto 2, but is the draft of a great play, written between 1585 and 1590, and the Second Quarto presents to us exactly the same state of things which we find in the later history of so many other of the Shakespearian plays—a revision so radical and in most respects so vastly improved as to make the play almost an independent work. We agree with Dr. Cairncross that it is quite certain that *Hamlet*, not Quarto 1 but the Folio version, was familiar before 1601 and that the topical references in the play can be readily explained in conformity with the date of 1588-9. Against this it is argued that *Hamlet* was not included by Francis Meres in his list of twelve Shakespearian plays in *Palladis Tamia* (1598). This is no certain indication that his list consisted of all the Shakespeare work published before 1598. It does not include, for example, *Henry VI*, although its three parts were written about or before 1590 and, as we know, had been extremely popular. There are peculiarities in the play as we have it upon which Dr. Duthie relies to show the existence of an older, non-Shakespearian work. There is the catchword ‘Hamlet, revenge,’ which is supposed to be an echo of the old play as the Shakespearian ghost utters no such injunction. Dr. Cairncross has shown that this type of phrase had become a stock one and that a species rather than a single play is ridiculed by Lodge, Dekker and Rowland.

Dr. Duthie has not approached what to ourselves are the real problems of Quarto 2. It appears to us that both this and the Folio Version indicate that the play had long been out of use and there might have been considerable difficulty in reconstructing the text. We think that the Second Quarto contains traces of two versions of the play, one of which was composed much earlier than the other. We are told that Hamlet is thirty years old—his age is fixed and emphasized by the first gravedigger. On the other hand earlier in the play both Laertes and Polonius stress Hamlet’s youth. The age of the characters certainly presents difficulty in many respects. If Hamlet is thirty, his mother must be at least forty-eight, and in Hamlet’s

view she is old enough to have subdued her passions, yet the King's infatuation for her is described as physical and it looks as if Shakespeare's later conception of Hamlet as a man of thirty instead of as a youth of twenty had been the later one. When did Hamlet fall in love with Ophelia? Apparently after his father's death and his father, when the play opens, has been dead for about two months, during which time the o'er hasty marriage between his widow and her brother-in-law had taken place. We know that Hamlet intended to return to Wittenberg after his father's funeral and he had been in a deep state of dejection since his mother's re-marriage. This is an unusual state of mind in which to fall in love. But these difficulties are inconsiderable compared with those which are raised by Horatio. He can remember the armour which the old King Hamlet wore in the combat which took place in the year of Hamlet's birth. Their friendship therefore must be an old established one, and it is very surprising that Horatio, who says himself that he came to Elsinore to see the late King's funeral should have been there for nearly a month without seeing his friend. Their first meeting is certainly not like that of old friends. But even more surprising is that in Quarto 2 there are two entirely different accounts of Horatio's past. He is treated by Bernardo and Marcellus as an old friend; as well acquainted with the great military preparations that are being made and with the current politics of Denmark, as well as one who knew the late king well. He is represented as a courtier of the present King and as in attendance on the Queen and in a position to procure for the sailors an audience with the King himself. Although he knows all about Ophelia's lunacy and death he never imparts the news to Hamlet, who is obviously surprised by the funeral cortege in the church yard where he stays to moralize on his return from England. But there is in the same Quarto an entirely different Horatio who is a complete stranger to the Court and not a Dane; Hamlet addresses him as a fellow student and appears to be ignorant as to the reason why he has visited Elsinore. This Horatio is so ignorant of the customs of the Danish Court as to enquire the meaning of the sound of trumpets

and of cannon and needs to be told that the Danes are great drinkers. This other Horatio only saw the late King once, has never heard of Yorick or of Osric, nor even of Laertes, and these facts appear to indicate that two stories have been woven into Quarto 2 and that this is in fact a composite text, part of which it is impossible to reconcile with the rest.

There is no doubt that the ghost believes that the Queen committed adultery before the murder of her husband, and implies that she was an accessory to the murder itself. When taxed with this she neither admits nor denies it and we are left with the impression that she was guilty of nothing more than an incestuous marriage. It is impossible to be certain.

The problem of Hamlet's relations with Ophelia is also insoluble. He tells us that he loved her. Why and when did he cease to do so and why treat her with such brutality reviling her with such language as no other of Shakespeare's tragic lovers uses to a woman, not even Othello, when he imagines his wife as an inmate of a brothel and Emilia the keeper of it?

The questions raised by the voyage to England are just as difficult and the great scene between Hamlet and his mother show two Hamlets which again are impossible to reconcile with each other. There is much in Hamlet's own character which it is very difficult indeed to explain. Why did he feign madness? Why did he delay the performance of what he undoubtedly conceived to be his duty? Why does he quibble with Laertes and why does he contrive the death of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern?

The truth appears to be that Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, as we have it, is a play of first and second thoughts and the discrepancies between these cannot be resolved. In the hand of his creator *Hamlet* grew into the measure of the stature and fullness of Shakespeare himself. Shakespeare did with his own early work what he had done with the work of other dramatists—used his own draft as a foundation upon which he reared a giant super-structure, too great for its base.

The real and lasting problem is the problem of the play

itself, not the relations between themselves of the various versions of it, nor yet the subjective vision of Hamlet the imagined man. The method of science—to search for evidence, for proof, for elimination of personal equation and demonstrable error and this without misrepresentation of any of the views assailed is that which Mr. J. M. Robertson pleaded should be applied to the solution of the Problem of *Hamlet*. That the play is, as Shakespeare wrote, inconsistent in conception and structure, troubles us not at all, either in the playhouse or in the theatre of the mind; that this is true is the highest tribute to the Shakespearian genius which had not only subdued the imagination of the learned and unlearned in every age, but which will continue to enthrall us as long as we are troubled by the mysteries of life and death.

THIS SHAKESPEARE.

A lad of seventeen, walking along the banks of the Avon one spring day, saw a girl in difficulties. She had been paddling and was caught fast in some rushes. The boy waded in, picked her up in his arms and carried her to safety.

Together they sat on the river bank, laughing at their little adventure, exchanging names and confidences. His was Will Shakespeare, he said. Her's, she told him, was Anne Hathaway.

Afterwards he walked with her to her home in Shottery and on the way back he realised he had fallen in love. The fact that she was eight years older than himself didn't seem to matter a bit.

It was the beginning of a romance that led the boy to marriage within a year—a marriage that has never failed since to excite the interest of lovers of Shakespeare's great plays.

Avon Valley abounds in beautiful old manor houses—none more beautiful than Chalecote (*sic*) Hall, near Stratford, which was the home of Sir Thomas Lucy, who is said to have had the poet driven from the town for stealing deer from his park.

If the poaching story is true, civilisation owes a debt of gratitude to the magistrate, otherwise Shakespeare, a father of three at the age of twenty-one, might have been content to remain an obscure country yokel.

From "Everybody's Weekly."

NOTES AND NOTICES.

A correspondent to *John o' London's Weekly* wanted a final opinion "whether one can correctly speak of 'Lord Bacon' or whether this description of the author of '*Advancement of Learning*' and Shakespeare's Plays (?) is 'colossal blunder.' Must we call him Lord Verulam?"

My opinion (replied *Jackdaw*), will be just as final as my correspondent chooses to think it. I hold that "Lord Bacon" is correct by custom if not by the rules of heraldry or etiquette. Bacon was "Lord Bacon." to Macaulay, who himself became "Lord Macaulay" on every tongue, not Lord Rothley, just as Tennyson is "Lord Tennyson," not "Lord Freshwater and Aldworth," and as John Morley became "Lord Morley," not Lord Blackburn. Bacon's standard biographer, James Spedding, calls him Lord Bacon. Perhaps Bacon would have been called Lord St. Albans, and later Lord Verulam, if, before his elevation to peerage, he had not been known as Lord Bacon in respect of his judicial rank, which then carried the title "Lord," whether its wearer was peer or commoner. The great Sir Edward Coke, Chief Justice of the King's Bench, was generally known as "Lord Coke"; he was never a peer. The "Lord Bacon" of the Bench became the Lord Bacon of literature in customary speech and writing within his own lifetime. The name stuck, and in a letter to Boswell dated February 15, 1776, just 150 years after Bacon's death, Dr. Johnson quotes from "Lord Bacon." The modern tendency seems to be to retain the surname of a man who has made it famous or familiar. Herbert Kitchener was never known as "Lord Khartum and Aspall." On the other hand, Alfred Harmsworth was never known as "Lord Harmsworth," but as Lord Northcliffe. Most people, I fancy, think of Palmerston as Lord Palmerston's surname, whereas this was Temple. Benjamin Disraeli glided into "Lord Beaconsfield" with perfect ease. Of course, Bacon can be named by his surname alone, or as

Francis, or as Sir Francis, Bacon'. He is rarely named Lord Verulam, as in Charles Mackay's verses, "*Street Companions*":—

*Whene'er through Gray's Inn porch I stray,
I meet a spirit by the way;
He breathes to me his burning thought,
He utters words with wisdom fraught,
He tells me truly what I am—
I walk with mighty Verulam.*

Mr. R. L. Eagle, writing to *John o' London's Weekly*, records that "about the year 1850, Ford Madox Brown painted an idealized portrait of Shakespeare which is now in the Manchester Gallery. A reproduction of it appeared in Spielmann's *The Stratford Monument*, and there seems to be no doubt that it was copied from Van Somer's portrait of Francis Bacon as engraved and published by Vertue in 1723. There are necessarily a few variations, and the artist has reversed the Vertue print."

Did Ford Madox Brown take Bacon as the model for the ideal Shakespeare? Was he one of the early Baconians? We know that not only have the romantics constructed biographies of Shakespeare but the artists have kept step with them and from time to time have presented various "counterfeit presentments" of his features for our selection. The dreadful Droeshout and "the miserable travesty which distresses the eye of the pilgrim" to Stratford were both too ugly and senseless to satisfy anyone who regarded them as portraits of the great Dramatist and efforts were continually made to improve and idealise them. These efforts were in some cases so successful that Mrs. C. M. Pott, writing in 1893, stated that some recent portraits of Shakespeare have far more resemblance to Francis Bacon than to the Stratford bust.

The Bacon Society appears to be "in the news" again, partly as a result, no doubt, of the first appearance in public of "BACONIANA." Alan Tomkins, the Man with the Inquiring Mind, writes in the *Sunday Dispatch*:

‘Now I have just got the latest BACONIANA, the 2s. 6d. quarterly, and find that the Bacon Society is still slinging punches at William, who has been a corpse for three centuries.

So, lifting up mine eyes from the Balkans, I said, ‘What is all this here, in the midst of a grim war?’

I found that the Bacon chaps were on the game as far back as 1769, and that they reached a state of frenzied outpouring in the latter half of the 19th century.

They said that Bill could not have had the knowledge and culture to write the plays, that Bacon had, and that Bacon kept mum lest he prejudice his reputation as a statesman.

Then they started digging out hidden messages and ciphers.

Hundreds of volumes and thousands of articles were written, for and against. There are claims that other gents had a hand in the matter, but we won’t confuse the issue.

I tried to study the better known ciphers, till I got a bit frantic. So I got hold of Mr. Valentine Smith, honorary secretary to the Bacon Society, and said, ‘Look here. Suppose it were proved with complete certainty that Bacon did or did not write Shakespeare, would that stop your society?’

‘Certainly not,’ he said, ‘That is not even our first object.’

‘What is your first object?’

‘To encourage study of the works of Francis Bacon as philosopher, lawyer, statesman and poet.’

There are many ways of spending a pleasant winter afternoon, according to the *News-Chronicle*.

‘There is, for example, the Bacon Society, which, so far from dying of inanition, now announces that its quarterly journal, BACONIANA, will in future be on public sale for the first time after private circulation since 1886. Copies of the society’s pamphlets on the eternal problem are reported to have been in considerable demand this

winter, and many a shelter has rocked to the cries of the heated disputants."

According to *The Star*:

"War does not dim the ardour of the Bacon Society. Paper shortage does not check their propaganda.

The October number of *BACONIANA* lies before me. Fifty pages of it, good quality paper, too, and pleasant type. A good half-crownsworth, if you think it is worth half a crown.

And in a leading article entitled "Discovering Shakespeare" according to the *Irish Times*:

"In spite of the fact that Shakespeare's plays have been published in several very cheap editions, it is unlikely that they have become any more familiar to the common people of England than previously. The war seems to have accomplished what a hundred cheap editions never could accomplish; for we read that the English people are re-discovering Shakespeare in these dark days. An inevitable result of a revival of interest in Shakespeare is a revival of interest in the attendant controversy regarding the authorship of the plays. The Bacon Society has been busy for some time past in an attempt to meet a heavy demand for pamphlets and other literature on the subject. The controversy may prove a further inducement to the more complete study of the plays, and the more complete study of the plays is highly desirable. Shakespeare is the greatest man England has ever produced; and the average Englishman probably knows less about his work than the average German. Certainly, the English children—and, indeed, the young men and women—are more fully acquainted with the latest American films than with any of Shakespeare's plays. Is a world-war necessary to make the English appreciate their own great men?

The theft of a Shakespeare First Folio from the library of Williams College (Massachusetts) came to light when the

four men involved were convicted and given varying terms of imprisonment.

The thieves obtained the valuable folio by means of a simple ruse, but, because of its rarity, they were unable to devise a means of disposing of it without detection.

After five months one of the men confessed that he had stolen the folio simply by disguising himself as a university professor and asking to look at it.

The police at first refused to believe him. It took him the better part of a day to convince them that he was not insane.

THE SOCIETY'S ANNUAL MEETING.

The Annual General Meeting of the Bacon Society was held at the Red House, New Bond Street, Bath, on Saturday, the 15th March, 1941.

Copies of the minutes have been sent to members and associates. The Council recommended there should be no nominations for the office of President left vacant by the death of Mr. B. G. Theobald, and this the meeting agreed.

Miss Durning Lawrence was elected one of the Vice-Presidents and Dr. W. S. Melsome as a member of the Council. No other changes were made and the names of the officers of the Society will be found as usual in *BACONIANA*.

The Council elected two new members and two associates and appointed Dr. W. S. Melsome joint editor of *BACONIANA*. Provision is to be made for the collection and protection, as far as is possible, of the Society's library and a committee was entrusted with this duty.

Consideration is being given to suggestions for the advertisement, enlargement, illustration and wider circulation of *BACONIANA*. It is hoped to obtain publication of articles stimulating public interest in the objects of the Society in other journals.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The Editor, BACONIANA.

31, Arundel Road, Cheam,
4th February, 1941

Dear Sir,

THE PADUA FIRST FOLIO.

Miss Leith's letter reminded me that I had a press cutting giving some information about this copy of the Folio of 1623 in which certain plays are cut for the purpose of acting, and stage directions, properties and actors' names inserted. These notes are said to be in a contemporary hand which would presumably be of the time of Charles I. The account was sent by the Rome Correspondent of "The Morning Post" and appeared in that paper on August 3rd, 1932, as follows:

A research examination in the bibliography of Shakespeare has just been completed by the Professor of English Literature at Florence University, Signor Gian Giordano Orsini, on the First Folio preserved in the University Library of Padua.

Hitherto the Folio has been strangely neglected by English scholars, and in the "Census" of Sir Sidney Lee it is dismissed with "early manuscript notes made apparently by an acting manager."

Professor Orsini, from the evidence of the script and from the character of the notes, reports that this is a contemporary "prompt" copy.

The manuscript notes were written against three plays—Measure for Measure, The Winter's Tale, and Macbeth. They include the names and the initials of vanished actors who played their parts in the pristine era of Shakespeare's glory.

It is also seen that Shakespeare's work was thus early severely cut for stage presentation, as in the above three dramas entire scenes, sections of scenes, groups of verses, single verses, and phrases are ringed off.

To suit some particular audience oaths and lusty phrases are carefully censored.

Warning points of entry for the actors are marked in the margin a few lines before their actual entry, so that all "cues" can be readily seen and mastered. It is at these places that the names of the actors are sometimes written. We accordingly learn that "Mr. Carlile" played the double role in Macbeth as "First Murderer" and as a Messenger. "Mr. Hewit" also played in this early staging of Shakespeare along with others recorded only by their initials, such as "T.S." and "K.G."

Full directions for the sounding of stage effects—thrilling instructions like "sennet, drum and colours," or "alarum and charge"—are also noted in the margin at their appropriate places, together with lists of stage properties.

Professor Orsini points out that these manuscript notes on the stage properties include in *Macbeth* an item not included in the printed Folio, and one which has now become an indispensable part of the incantation scene—the witches' cauldron.

A detailed list of the cuts and marginal notes will be included in a paper by Professor Orsini on "Nuovi orientamenti della filologia Shakespeariana" which is being published in "Civiltà Moderna."

It is needless to point out, perhaps, that as the notes must have been made in or after 1623, and Shakespeare died in 1616, the actors did not necessarily belong to the pristine era of Shakespeare's "glory." There are no names of the "principall actors" mentioned in the First Folio which correspond with the names and initials of the players marked in the Padua Folio. It is unfortunate that these are only performers in small parts.

Baconians have always contended that the great masterpieces were never performed in the public theatres in the form in which they were written as it was action and not philosophy which "the gaping auditors" required.

No further news of Professor Orsini's researches appear to have been published here.

Yours faithfully,

R. L. EAGLE.

"Livorno,"

St. Andrew's Road,

Great Malvern,

Worcs.

March 19th, 1941.

Francis E. C. Habgood, Esq.

Dear Sir,

In the January issue of *BACONIANA*, mention is made of an inquiry by W.P.D., addressed to Notes and Queries, referring to these lines from Shakespeare's *The Phoenix and the Turtle*:—

"And thou treble dated crow

That they sable gender makest

With the breath thou giv'st and tak'st."

These probably refer to a legend, recorded in Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* lib x C15).

"Ore eos parere aut coire vulgus arbitratur," viz., the vulgar believe that the crow generates its progeny by the mouth. In the British Museum's Library there is a translation into English of Pliny's *Nat. History*, which may date back to Shakespeare's time.

I came across the following when reading "The Malvern County," by Bertram C. A. Windle, D.S.C., F.R.S., F.S.A., London, Methuen & Co. On p. 92 it says:—The records of the diocese (Worcester) are stored above the gateway of the Cathedral called Edgar's Tower. Amongst them is the valuable document, the bond entered into by Fulk Sandells and John Rychardson, in connection with the marriage license of "Willaim Shagspere and Ann Hathway of Stratford. 28 Nov. 25 Eliz."

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) ALFRED WEINSTRAUD.